

This high-level meeting was preceded by two days of talks between the officials of the two Governments aided by the Central Water and Power Commission.

Mr. Patil is understood to have assured Mr. Karunanidhi that the legitimate needs of Madras would not be jeopardised by any project that his Government might undertake on the Hemavathi.

Madras has been voicing fears that the reservoir level at the Mettur Dam might drop to levels that would not sustain the irrigation in the Cauvery delta if the Hemavathi waters were used in Mysore State itself."

This is my fear. What the Madras Government wanted, the Mysore Government is prepared to give.

Mr. SPEAKER.—This statement is alleged to have been made on 21st August 1968 and the adjournment motion was presented to me by the hon'ble Member Channabasappa yesterday through one of his messengers at 10.10 A.M. and the House was to meet at 12 O'clock. According to clause (iii) of rule 53 the motion should be restricted to a specific matter of recent occurrence. The question before the House and before me is whether this is a matter of recent occurrence. According to him, the occurrence was on 21st August 1968 and notice is given on 18th September, i.e., almost one month after the date of occurrence. The present session started on the 2nd and the hon'ble Member should have taken the earliest opportunity to bringing up this matter as an adjournment motion which he has done. Therefore, I hold that it is not a matter of recent occurrence and therefore under clause (iii) of rule 52 I withhold my consent to the adjournment motion.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—May I know what is "recent occurrence" according to the Chair? What date will be counted as "recent occurrence"?

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Chair cannot give an opinion on a hypothetical case.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—I take the ruling of the Chair with great respect because of the due weight that has been given to this all-important subject.

MOTION re: THE REVISION OF 1924 CAUVERY VALLEY AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE STATE OF MYSORE AND MADRAS

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—Sir, I rise to another point about the motion which I sent long back, before I went to the hospital. Till this minute I have not received any communication as to whether it is admitted or not admitted.

MR. SPEAKER.—I have not decided the point whether to give consent or not to give consent. If the hon'ble member wants to say something about it, I have no objection.

SRI H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—Mr. Speaker, the hon'ble members of this House either on this side or that side, are entitled to have their motions which are in order admitted and discussed on the floor of this House. I submitted to your attention a motion—I forget the date—it was sometime before I was admitted to the hospital of about 10 or 12 days back. According to the statement made by the hon'ble Speaker yesterday today is the last day and probably we have only two or three hours before we adjourn *sine die*. Till now, this all-important question which has got a bearing on the overall economic condition of the country and which has got an effect on the suffering, millions of people getting into permanent poverty, has not come up and if this subject does not get adequate attention and if the hon'ble members' sentiment is not respected, I submit that I very very pathetically feel that the hon'ble members' legitimate rights are getting infringed. In order to highlight the importance of this, a similar motion has been signed by 45 members of this House and I may submit that I am also one of the signatories to it and probably I am the first signatory to it. On such an important issue no decision has been taken and the subject matter is the same. That means to say that the hon'ble Speaker has not been able to make up his mind at all although notice has been given nearly 10 days ago. I know that the Chief Minister is not anxious that we should discuss it. He is positively against the discussion and if his words to prevail as against the rights of members of this House, I am afraid democracy is in danger.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URUS.—Sir, I may be permitted to speak.

MR. SPEAKER.—Is the member one of the signatories?

† **SRI DEVARAJ URUS.**—No, I am not a signatory to the adjournment motion. I believe, the motion, that the hon'ble member has just now proposed to move is in accordance with rule 146. If you permit I have a submission to make. The subject matter that the hon'ble Sri H. M. Chaunabasappa proposes to bring before the House for discussion is with respect to Cauvery Waters and utilisation of Cauvery waters which is governed by the 1924 Agreement between the Madras Government and Mysore Government. This assumes importance now because of the alleged statement that has appeared in the Press.

MR. SPEAKER.—This is altogether a different thing. This has nothing to do with the statement said to have been made by the Chief Minister in the Press.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URUS.—I am not trying to say anything. The statement that has appeared with respect to the Agreement that is likely to have been reached between the Government of Mysore represented by the Chief Minister and officers of the P.W.D. and the Madras Government represented by the P.W.D. Minister of that Government in the presence of

the Central Government Minister Dr. K. L. Rao and officers of the Central Water and Power Commission. This has got a bearing on the rights of our State. Here the question is that 1924 Agreement was sought to be re-opened by the Government of Mysore, I believe in the year 1957-58. We are also told that the then Government appointed a committee of Engineers of the Department who went into the question and brought out in the committee report that there was a great need, an immediate need, for the revision of the 1924 Agreement which would otherwise jeopardise the interests of the State with respect to subsequent utilisation of Cauvery waters. Now, in case an Agreement or understanding is reached or the Chief Minister on behalf of the State were to say that we will abide by the 1924 Agreement, our fear is that the very agreement which the Chief Minister is purported to have stated or agreed to, goes again what was sought to be revised by the same Government in the year 1958. If then they had very good reasons to think of revising, it must be for some valid reasons in the interests of the State. Now to say anything without going through the question of revising the Agreement, merely to get concurrence of the Central Government or the Planning Commission for taking up the Hemavathy Project, will only confirm our fear that whatever rights that were likely to be affected by this 1924 Agreement, will be there. When once we agree to abide by the 1924 Agreement, I am afraid we will not have a case in future to re-open this question of revising the 1924 Agreement. Now the whole question boils down to this. Whether we should stick to 1924 Agreement as it is today or whether there is case for our Government to re-open the whole question in the light of the developments that have taken place, subsequent to 1924 upto this day? If it is merely just for the sake of getting technical clearance for one project, namely Hemavathi, can we give up whatever rights that we have for the utilisation of Cauvery waters? I am not here to say whether this is right or that is right because at this moment it is not for us to go into the question. One thing that I wish to submit is, it is really agitating the minds of those who have very genuine doubt about the 1924 Agreement and its consequential effects on our rights to utilise the Cauvery waters. So, Sir, in this light I would request the Chair to consider this question. It is for the Chair to make up its mind whether to give consent or not to this matter of great importance which is going to affect the future of a large portion of our population in this State.

Sri H. M CHANNABASAPPA.—Sir, by way of clarification I want to say one thing or the information of the hon'ble Speaker and also to the hon'ble members of this House. I wish to refer you to page 65 of the Ad hoc Committee report constituted by the Government on 7th February 1959 for reviewing the Inter-State Agreement on River Valleys.

2.30 P.M.

In this connection the Chief Minister has to come out with a statement what is the surplus water that is available after impounding in

(SRI H. M. CHANNABASAPPA)

K. R. S. There has been a gauging. From the gauge it can be seen what has been impounded and what has not been impounded. It is only for the surplus water that we have to build our reservoirs. The surplus water that is available is only 10 T. M. Cft. But you are saying that 45 T. M. Cft. of water is available and with this false assumption you are sinking your funds in constructing Hemavathi Project. You are spending about 16 to 24 crores. For whose benefit you are going to spend—after all for how much quantity of water you are spending—it is only for 10 T. M. Cft. Your assumption is wrong. You cannot fill your reservoirs. When there is no water how can you build Kambadakada and H-rangi. You are letting down all the water to Madras and only 10 T. M. Cft. is left to you. You are letting down the people of the State and you are favouring the Madras Government. As per the instructions of the Chief Minister the Engineer came and met me. I asked him one question and that is, is the Government of Mysore entitled to utilise 45 T. M. (ft. of water as per this 1924 agreement? He did not come out with correct information. I want to ask whether the Chief Minister has come out with that statement on the assurance of the Chief Engineer. The Madras Government is terribly afraid of a committee to be formed to go into this question because they have violated the 1924 agreement. I want to ask, if the 1924 agreement is to be revised, what are the grounds? The Madras Government has constructed many projects without consulting us. They want to have these projects regularised. Even the Centre may agree to this because the Madras Government has already constructed. Therefore you have to oblige them and you are already doing that. By doing this you are letting down the interests of the State. Therefore the entire State is very much interested to know what is being done by the Government in this matter and what it proposes to do, to have its due share, and what is the outcome of the discussions that have been held in this respect so far. These are very important things the people should know. Therefore I appeal to the Chair to accord consent to have discussion on this matter in the interest of the State.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎಂ. ಸಂಗೇಗೌಡ (ಅರ್ಕಳಗ್ಗಡು).—ಜಾನ್ಯ ಉದ್ಯೋಗೀರೇ, 146 ನೇ ದಿಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನಾವು ಒಂದು ವೇಳಾವನ್ ಸೋಟಿನ್ ಕೆಷ್ಟ್‌ದ್ವೀಪ್. ಕಾರ್ಪಿರ್ ನೀಡನ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ವೇಗುಷಾರು ಮತ್ತು ಮದ್ದಾನ್ ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳ ನಡುವೆ ಅಗಿರುವ 1924 ನೇ ಇನ್‌ಮೆಂಟನ್‌ನ್ನು ಪ್ರಸರ್ ದಿಂದು ಈ ವಾದಬೇಕು, ಸರ್ಕಾರದರದರ್ದ ತಾತ್ತ್ವರೂಪದ ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕ್ರಾಪನ್‌ ಕ್ರಾಪನ್‌ ದೇರು ಎನ್‌ತಕ್ಕೆದ್ದು ನಮ್ಮ ವೇಳಾವನ್. ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಇದರ ಆರ್ತ್ಯ ವಿತಕ್ಕೆ ಬಿತ್ತು, ಇದರ ಅರ್ಥಂತ ಯಾವರೀತಿ ಇವೆ ಎನ್‌ತಕ್ಕೆದ್ದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಹೇಳುವಾಗಿ ಅಣಿಕ್ಷತನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಬೇ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಕ್ಕಿಕಾರ್ ಕ್ಕಿಯಾರ್ನ್ ಪಡೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ್ ಯಾವುದೂ ಒಂದು ಬೇರೆ ಅಸಕ್ತಿಯಿಂದ ಪ್ರಯುತ್ತ ವಾಡುತ್ತದ್ದಾರ. ಮುಂದೆ ಈ ಸಂಭೇ ಸೇರುವುದರ ಒಳಗ್ಗೆ 1921 ನೇ ಇನ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಅಗ್ರಮೆಂಟ್‌ಗೆ ಬಿಂಗ್‌ ನಿರ್ದಿ, ಮದ್ದಾನ್‌ನಿರಲ್ಯ ಪರವಾನಿ ಮತ್ತೆ ತರ ಅಣಿ ಕಟ್ಟಿ ಗಳನ್ನು, ಅಕ್ಕಮಾವಾಗಿ ಕಟ್ಟಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಮ್ಮತಿ ನೀಡುವ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಾರ್ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ರಾವರಿಗೂ ಮತ್ತು ನಮ್ಮ ವೇಗುಷಾರಿನ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ್ ನಡುವೆ ಏನು ಒಷ್ಟಂದ ನಡಿದೆ ಯೊಂದು ವರದಿಯಾಗಿದೆಯೋ ಅ ಬ್ರಾಹ್ಮಾಂದ್ರ ಅದರ ಒಳಗ್ಗೆ ಎಡಿ ಅದರ ಅಧಾರದ ವೇಲೆ ಹೇಳುವಾಗಿ ಅಣಿ ಕಟ್ಟಿನ್ನು ಕೆಮ್ಮುಪುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದರವರು ಚೆಕ್ಕಿಕೊಂಡಿನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯುವುದಾದರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯದ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎನ್. ನಂಜೇಗೌಡ)

ಶ್ರೇಷ್ಠ ಮಾಡಲೇಬೇಕು. ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲರೆ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಮಹಾಕಾಳ ಮಾಡಿ ದುತಾಗಾತ್ಮಕ. ಇದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಈ ನಾಯಕರು ಏಳು ನವಸ್ಯನ್ನು ನಂಬಿಕೆಗೆ ತಗ್ದಿಕೊಂಡು ಡಾಂಡತ್ವದಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ಮಾಡಲೇಕು. ದೇಶವ ಇನ್ನಾ ಅತ್ಯಾವಾನ್ಯ ಸರಕಾರ ಹೋಗಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡುವಾರದು. ಇವಕ್ಕೆ ಬುಡಿತ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಏಂದು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಪರ್ಯಾಯ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

† Sri B. P. GANGADHAR (Tumkur).—Sir, I fully agree with the emphatic assertions made by one of the Leading Members of the Opposition, Sri H. M. Channabasappa. The matter is of very grave importance to the people of this State especially when we have to meet with the drought and famine conditions year after year consecutively for the past four years. Sir, it is needless for me to stress that always we will be short of water.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The member may speak only on the question of consent.

Sri B. P. GANGADHAR.—I will take only one or two minutes.

Sir, as I said, it is needless for me to submit that we have to view all these matter with great care and caution.

The statement made by the Chief Minister as reported in the Press causes serious doubt in the minds of everybody concerned. People who are thinking in the interest of the State and of the well-being of the countrymen on both sides of the House, are very seriously exercised over this matter. We do not know what exactly is the assurance that the Chief Minister has given to the State of Madras and also the Central Government. It is a fit matter to be discussed and we request your indulgence not for ourselves, but keeping in view the interests of the entire State, the destinies of nearly 2 crores of people, we are not meeting in session after today. I therefore request you that we may extend the sitting by one more day if necessary. It does not cost the Government anything more. I may give the assurance that we on this side of the House, the Opposition will not even press for sitting charges of Rs. 25 per day, because it is an important matter. I submit to you Sir, you may kindly agree to give permission to discuss this matter which is concerning the entire State. Regarding the gravity of the matter, I do not want to say anything more. I hope and trust you will kindly accord permission to discuss this matter on the floor of this House, so that there will be a chance for the Chief Minister also to clarify the position and also explain what he proposes to do in the matter. If he has given any undertaking, he will disclose to the House what exactly are the terms of the undertaking he has given to the Central Government, in the matter and what is the position of the Mysore Government.

Sri D. DEVARAJA URS.—Sir, in addition to what I have said, I submit another point.

In the Taird Plan, proposals were made for two dams, namely Harangi and Hemavathi and a smaller dam at Kambadakada. During

the course of the third plan for various reasons, these projects could not be taken up. Anyhow, works were started about 2 years back both in respect of Harangi and Hemavathi. Subsequently, we have been told by the Central Government that because of objections raised by the Madras Government, it has not been possible to give technical clearance to these projects. Today, according to the statement given by the Chief Minister through the Press, we come to know that they have agreed to give technical clearance provided the Mysore Government agrees to stick to the 1924 Agreement. There is the other point, what about Harangi? So far, according to our information, they have not given technical clearance to this project. There is the other project Kambadakada which was proposed under the third Plan itself. Even allocations of funds were made. Even now, we do not know whether the Madras Government.....

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—If the Hon'ble Member yields, Kambadakada and Harangi projects have been proposed right from the Second Plan.

Sri D. DEVARAJ URUS.—They were finalised during the course of the third plan per. od.

We do not even know whether the Madras Government is going to raise objections in case we want to press for technical clearance for the other two projects.

The other point is, what will be the consequential result in case we reiterate our sticking to 1924 Agreement. The 1924 Agreement is already there. What makes the Madras Government to compel us to say that unless the Mysore Government makes a categorical statement that they stick to the 1924 Agreement, we are not prepared to give our consent for technical clearance. That means, the Madras Government obviously feel that if the Mysore Government were to raise the question of reopening the 1924 Agreement, according to them perhaps they think that will go against their interest. Here in our State, we have asked our Chief Engineers to go into the question and give a report to the Government. The report says, unless we revise the 1924 agreement, it may be against our interest to continue to stick to that agreement. Such being the situation, supposing we say and reiterate our stand that we are going to agree to the 1924 Agreement, that obviously means that we are not going to agitate for the re-opening this question of 1924 agreement. Supposing by implication, or otherwise indirectly, it is meant that the consent for the purpose of getting clearance for Hemavathi we agree for 1924 Agreement, I would like to know whether it will be possible at any later stage for the Mysore Government to re-open this subject of 1924 agreement, because when we give that consent, it binds us for all time. As an analogy I would say.....

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I would like to know from the Hon'ble Member whether the 1924 Agreement is something like a pole-star or permanent thing like the Sun and the Moon, or is there any provision wherein by 1974 it is liable to be revised?

SRI D. DEVARAJ URUS.—Sir, this question, I wish the Hon'ble Member had put when the motion was actually taken for discussion.

SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I am only asking as a lay man. I want to know why 1974 was fixed as the year for expiry of the 1924 Agreement and whether the Agreement is revisable or not.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URUS.—According to my knowledge I do not claim to have gone through every page that has been written on it. In fact the 1924 Agreement and all the literature connected with it are covered in four volumes. I am sorry I did not bring those volumes here. I do not claim to have read every page of all the four volumes. In substance what I have said is that this Agreement holds good till the year 1974. Till that period they have given us the right to utilise 45 TMCFT of water which is said to be in surplus so far as the Cauvery Valley within the Mysore State is concerned. We are now proposing to utilise that 45 TMCFT of water by building the Hemavathy Project, the Haraangi Project, the Kabini Project and similar other projects if there are any at all. We were under the impression that the Madras Government has no reason to raise objection as long as the 1924 Agreement exists and as long as the 1924 Agreement gives us the right to utilise the 45 TMCFT of Cauvery water in the Cauvery valley. But now the Madras Government comes up to say: "Look here, you cannot build Hemavathy Project without our consent because it is going to work against our interests." So we have got to sit up and think seriously whether the Madras Government can question us about the utilisation of the water to which we are entitled under the 1924 Agreement which is binding on both the Madras and Mysore Government. Obviously the Madras Government have a lurking suspicion that the Mysore Government are trying to raise the issue for revision of the Agreement. Why did we think of revising that Agreement? Because of the report given by technicians and engineers who have submitted a report; wherein they have stated that unless we revise this Agreement, we are going to be affected adversely and seriously. That is the report of experts.

I recall to the memory of the Chair as well as this House one aspect about the Krishna Valley Project, which is quite relevant to the issue before us. In 1951 or so, the then Chief Minister Sri K. C. Reddy, at present the Governor of Madhya Pradesh, gave his consent with regard to the allocation of Krishna Valley waters, which was under dispute. Hon'ble Member Sri Jatti says that he has signed it. Whatever it is, whether he has signed it or not, in season and out of season, whenever this allocation of Krishna waters comes up, the Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh and the concerned Andhra Ministers harp on this agreement or consent given by the then Chief Minister of Mysore; they say that the Mysore Government is bound by the consent given in the year 1951 by the then Chief Minister and ask: why does the Mysore Government go back on the consent given by it? Very recently I read that statement made by the hon'ble Minister of Andhra Pradesh. So when once the Chief Minister commits himself to the fact

that we have given up the right indirectly of raising the dispute with regard to the 1924 Agreement, I am afraid it will become binding on future Governments. I am not a lawyer but my commonsense says that if the Chief Minister commits himself it will be binding on the future Governments also. At a subsequent stage if our Government says that it wants to have the agreement revised in 1974 on the ground that it is disadvantageous to Mysore, Madras Government will get up and say: "Look here, the Chief Minister of Mysore has already given his consent in the year 1968 to stick to the 1924 Agreement."

Sri L. SRIKANTAI A H.—Will the hon. Member please convince the House that the contract is still binding after 1974?

Sri D. DEVARAJ URS.—After 1974, we do not know the position. One clause in that Agreement says that after 1974, both the Governments will sit together and discuss the question of further utilisation and sharing of waters. I want to tell the Hon. House that Madras has already utilised the maximum water that could be utilised by it. Unfortunately it is only Mysore that is lagging behind in utilising the Cauvery waters to the maximum extent. Excepting Krishnarajusagar Dam in the Cauvery Valley, no other project has come up. I think the Kabini project is in its foundation level although the dam work started years ago. We have not been able to build any other dam. The fact remains that so far as Mysore Government is concerned, its right to utilise 45 TMCFT. of Cauvery waters according to the 1924 Agreement has been fully exercised and if by 1974 we are not in a position to fully utilise the water provided under the Agreement, what happens? God only knows. We do not know the consequential effect after the 1924 Agreement comes to an end at the end of 1974. We cannot visualise what is going to happen after 1974. If we do not utilise 45 TMCFT of water, there may be series of objections. So up to 1974 we are anxious to safeguard our rights and want to build up our dams and utilise the Cauvery Valley waters to the best of our ability. If the Motion is permitted, there will be scope for discussion of all the points that have been raised so far and we will be in a position to know from the Government what the position is with regard to the several issues and questions that have been raised.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—What have the former Mysore Government done?

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—The hon'ble Member raised a very relevant point. In the year 1957 or somewhere about that, the Madras Government constructed Bhavani and other projects and they wanted to create prescriptive rights. The Government of Mysore immediately got scent of it and applied to the Government of India, for arbitration. The Government of India has been seized of the matter. This is on 28th April 1959—nine years ago. The Union Ministry for Irrigation and Power and the Planning Commission proposed to call a meeting of the representatives of the Governments of Madras and Mysore early to

(SRI H. M. CHANNABASAPPA)

discuss the differences between the two Governments and arrive at an equitable settlement. The then Deputy Minister for Irrigation Sri Jaishukla Hathi has disclosed in the Lok Sabha that the Government of India is seized of the matter. So it is not now we are having our dispute. We are having our dispute from 1958 and the Government of India is seized of it. Specially now the Government of India could use its good offices and refer the dispute for arbitration. Now if we say that we will guarantee all the projects that have been constructed legally or illegally, we will be regularising all the violations that have been committed by the Madias Government. That apart, I submit only one joint for consideration: On 75 per cent dependability, not more than 10 TMCFT of water will be available, let alone 45 TMCFT. If there are engineers here advising the Chief Minister, let them go into the figures I have given. These are all matters of highly technical and highly legal on which a thorough study is required by not only members of this House but senior members. Therefore I can carry the Chief Minister with me; I will try to carry the Chief Engineer if only an opportunity is given. If no opportunity is given, what to do? The interest of the country will go unasked. Where is the harm to the Chief Minister to have an open discussion? These are all public matters which are to be thrashed out on facts and figures and not to be dealt with in secrecy. Otherwise, you will be sentencing millions of people to perpetual poverty.

3-00 P.M.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ (ಅರ್ಥಾತ್ ಶ್ರೀ ಕಾಮೇರಿ ನೀಡಿನ ಹಂಚಿಕೆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ 1921ರಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ, ಅಗ್ರಮೆಟನ ಸೆಲಪು ಅಂಶಗಳಿಂದ ಈ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಹಿತಕ್ಕೆ ಧರ್ಮಕ್ಕೆ ಯುಂಟಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬ ಎನ್ನಾವನನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ಸಂಖ್ಯಾದಾದ ನಿಯಂತ್ರಣೆಯನ್ನು ತಾವು ತ್ವರ್ತಿಕ್ಕಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣ ಹೀಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ: - ಇದು ರೀಸೆಂಟ್ ಅಕರನ್ನು ಅಲ್ಲ, ಮತ್ತು ಸದಸ್ಯರು 18ನೇ ತಾರಿಖು, ಬಹಳ ತಪಾಗಿ ಸಂಚಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರು ಎನ್ನಾವ ಅಭಿಭಾಯವನ್ನು, ಕೊಟ್ಟಿ ತಳ್ಳಿಹಾಕಿದ್ದೀರಿ, ಅದನ್ನು ನಾನು ತ್ವರ್ತಿಪಡಿಸುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಎರಡನೆಯದಾಗಿ ಇವತ್ತು ತಂತ್ರ ತಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಬಂದಿರಿವ ಸಂಚಯ, ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಚನ್ನೆಬಾಪ್ಪನ್ನು ಸರಿ ಅಸ್ತಿತ್ವಗೆ ಹೋಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಸೂಚನೆ. ಸದ್ಗುಣಾರ್ಥಿರ್ವಾದ ವೋತ್ವಾ. 8-10 ದಿವಸ ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಎನ್ನ ಅರ್ಥಾತ್ ಸದಾ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಆದರಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತ್ರಾಗಿ ಕಾರೇರಿ ನಾಯಿ ಜಲಾಸಯಿನ ಭಾವಿಯಾಲ್ಲಿ ಬಿರುವಂತಹವರು, ತುಂಬಾ ವಿವರಣೆಯನ್ನು 40 ಇನ್ ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ, ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚಿಯಾಗಬೇಕೆಂದು ಈ ಸಂಚಯನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಬಿಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಿ ತೀರ್ಣೇ, ತ್ವರ್ತಿಹಾಕು ತ್ವರ್ತಿ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾನು ಹೋಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾನು ತಮ್ಮಲ್ಲ ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳಿ ಪಡು ಇಷ್ಟೇ, ಮಾನ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಇದ್ದಾರೆ, ಅವರ ಹೊಣಿ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಬಿಕಾರಿ, ತುಂಬಾ ದೇಹದ್ದಿದ್ದಾರು. ಈ ಕಾಮೇರಿ ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟ ನೀಡಿನ ಆ ಭಾಗಾಗ ಜ್ಞಾನಿಗೆ ಹೀಗೆ ಹಂಜಾಮಾವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಕ್ರಿಷ್ಣಾಂಗ ಗೋದಾವರಿ ನೀರಿನ ಹಂಚಿಕೆ ಏಷಯಿದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಹಳ ದಿವಸಗಳ ಕಾಲ ನಾವು ಎಂದಾದಿ, ಎಂದಾದಿ, ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಚನ್ನೆಬಾಪ್ಪನಾವು ಒತ್ತಾಯಿತದಿಸಿದಾಗಲ್ಲಾ ಕೇಂದ್ರದ ವೇಲೆ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ದವರು ಸಾಕಾದಮ್ಮ ಒತ್ತಾಯಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಇಷ್ಟ್ಯು ಹೋತ್ತಿಗೆ ಏನಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಅರ್ಥಾತ್ ಸದಾ ಸಂಪನ್ಮೂಲ. ನಾವು ಹೊಸ್ತಾಗಿ ಸನ್ಪತ್ತ ಇದೆ, ವಿಧೇಯದ ಪಾಟೀರ್ವಾದವರು ಆದ್ಯಹಾಕ್ ಆಗಿ ಹಂಚಿಕೆಯಾದಾಗ ಈ ಪಾನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತೆಳ್ಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ನಾವು ಅದ್ಯಹಾಕ್ ಹಂಚಿಕೆ ಬೇಕ್ಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ, ನಾನು ವಾದ ಪಾಲನ್ನು ಕೂಡಬೇಕು ಇಷ್ಟ್ಯುದ್ದರೆ ನಾವು ಅರ್ಚಿಸ್ತೇನಾಗೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಹೆಚ್. ಸಿದ್ದ ಪ್ರೀತಪ್ಪ.—ಕಾಂಟಾರ್ಕ್ ಅಕ್ಷಪ್ರಯಾಸಗಳ ಭಾರತ ವ್ಯಾಪಾರದ ಪನ್ನೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸ್ತೇನೆ. ಇವು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದೆ. ಪ್ರತಿನೆಂಟೇ, ಇವುಗೂಟಬೆಲ್ಲೇ ರಿವೆಸರ್‌ಬೆಲ್ಲೇ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿದೆ ಹೀಗೆ ಹೊರತು ಕೇಳಿರು ಅಡ್ಡ.

ಅಗ ತೀರ್ ವಿರೇಂದ್ರಪಾಟೀಲರು ಬುತ್ತರ ಕೆಂಡುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಕಮಿ ವೈದ್ಯರ್ಲೋ ರಿವರ್. ಹಾರಂಗ ವೈದ್ಯರ್ಲೋ ರಿವರ್ ಅಲ್ಲ. ಅದು ವೈಕುಲ್ಯರ್ ರಿವರ್ ಆಗಿದೆ ಎಂಬು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಕಮಿನಿ ಪಾರ್ಜೆಕ್ಟ್ ಪೂರ್ಣ ವಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಗ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾದತಿ ಪ್ರಾಚೀಕರ್ನ್ ಕಟ್ಟುಪುಡಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊರಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ 16 ಕೋಟಿಯೋ ಹಿಂದಿನ 20 ಕೋಟಿಯೋ ಅಗಬಹುದು. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಶ್ವ ನೀರನ್ನು ಜಿಂಬಾಂಡ್ ವಾಡುತ್ತಿರೋ? 20-21 ಟಿ.ಪಿ.ಸಿ.ಎಫ್.ಟಿ. ನೀರು ಎಂಬಿ ಅಂದಾಜು ಇರಬಹುದು. ಅದರೆ ನವುಗೆ ಬಿಂಬಿಸು ಎಷ್ಟು? ಎಂಬಿಸದನ್ನು ಯೋಜನೆ ವಾಡಬೇಕು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಹಿರೇಂದ್ರ, ಪಾಟಿಲ್ (ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು).—ಈ ಲಿಚಾರ ಬಹಳ ಸೂಕ್ತವಾದುದು. ಇದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಸರ್ವ ಮಾಡಿ ಗಾದ್ಯಕ್ರಾಂತಾದ ಭಾಷಣಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ ನಾವು ಈರೆರು ಎಂದು ಬುಜತ್ತಪ್ಪ ಕೊಡರೆ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದು ಬಹಳ ಜಿಲ್ಲಾಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನಮನ್ಯ ಆಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಡಿ. ಬಣಕಾರ್. — ಇದರ ಪ್ರೇರಿ ನಾವು ಚೆಚ್ಚಿ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಬೇಡವೇ !

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಟ್ಟೆ. ಎನ್. ನಂಜೀಗೌಡ.—ಇದರಿಂದ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ನಷ್ಟ ವಾದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮುಖ್ಯವಂತಿಗಳು ವಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಗಂಭೀರವಾಗಿ ವಾತನಾಡಬೇಕು. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರೂ ಭಾಷಣ ವಾಡಿ ಶಾರರು ಅನ್ನಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ, ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ದೇಶದ ಹಿತದ್ವಯಿಲುಂದ ಬಿಂದು ವಾತನಾಡುತ್ತದೆಯೇ. ನಾವೇನೂ ಬೇಕೊಷರಾಗಿ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ, ದನಕಾಯೋ ಹುಡುಗರಾಗಿ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ, ನಾವು ಹಗಲೂ ರಾತ್ರಿ ಕ್ಷಮೆತಪ್ಪು ಬಿಡ ಅರ್ಥವಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ವಾತನಾಡಬೇವೇ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I want to know whether Sri Gopala Gowda has finished his speech?

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—Sir, I want a clarification from the Chief Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I shall give the member an opportunity for clarification.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹೇಳಿದ ಒಂದು ಚಂದು ಚೂರಿಗೆ ನನ್ನ ಒಂಮೆ ಪ್ರತಿಭಿಷಣನೆ ಇದೆ. ಈ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಪ್ರತಿಭಾಕಾಗಿ ಬಳಸುತ್ತಾ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಇನ್ನಿಂದಿನ ನಿರ್ವಹಣೆಯ ಒಂದು ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರಕಾಗಿ ರಾಜ್ಯದ್ವಾರಾ ಇಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಲಭು ತುಳ್ಳಿ ತಪ್ಪಿ. ಒರಿಗುವಿರುವ ಯಾರೂ ಯಾರೂ ಚಂಪಣಿಯ ಅಗಿದ ಆಸೆ ಇಂದ್ರಿಕ್ಯಾಕ್ಷಣಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇದ್ದು ತಪ್ಪಿ. ಯಾರಾರಾರಾ ಮಾತನಾಡಿರ ಅರಾರು ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಯ ಅಗಿದೆ ನ್ನು ಪ್ರದ್ಯಂತಿಯಿಂದ ಮಾತನಾಡ ತುರ್ತಿ ಎಂದು ಅರಾರು ತಿಳಿಪುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದು ತುಳ್ಳಿ ತಪ್ಪಿ. ಇದು ಗಂಭೀರವಾದ ವಿಷಯ ನನ್ನ ದಂಬಗೆ ಯಾರೂ ಕೂಡಾ ನಾವಾನು ವಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಅರಾರು ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅವರೆ ಹ್ಯಾಂಡೆ ಹೇಳಿಕೊಂಡು. ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಮಾಡುವ ಕೆಲವು ಖಾನಗಿ ಜನರು ಯಾರೂ ಮಾಡುವುದಕಾಗುವಾದಿಲ್ಲ. ನವನ್ಯರು ಯಾರೂ ಮಾಡುವುದಕಾಗುವಾದಿಲ್ಲ ಎನ್ನುವ ಭಾವವೇ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಒತ್ತುಬೇಕು. ಇದು ಎಲ್ಲಾಮೇಲೂ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ ಇದೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಜಂಕ್ಷನ್ ವಾದಲ್ಕು ಅವಕಾಶ ಪ್ರಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರು. ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಸಾರ್ವಜಂಕರ ಪರಿಷಯ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ವಿಷಯ ವಿಷಯ ಅಗಿದಿರು. ಇದ್ದರ್ಲಿಯಾವ ಗ್ರಂಥಕ್ಕೆ ವಿವರಿಸುವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ರಾಜ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಖಿಯಂಥ ವಿಷಯ, ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಹಿತಾತ್ಮಕಗಳನ್ನು ಕಾಪಾಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ವಿಷಯ. 1924 ರಾಜ್ಯ ಅಗಿ ಮುಂಚು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ. 50 ವರ್ಷ ಅಗುಂವಾಗಿ ಇದನ್ನು ಪುನರ್ವಾಪಿಸಿ ಮಾಡುವ ಹಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಅಗಿಮುಂಚು ಅದಾಗ ಇಡರಿಂದ ನಮ್ಮ ಸಂಸಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಒಕ್ಕೂರಾದಾಗುವಾದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದು ಆಗ ಇಷ್ಟು ಸಾರ್. ಎಂ. ವಿಶ್ವಾಸರ್ಯಾನವರು ಬಹು ಲಗ್ಗಿ ಹಂತವಾಗಿ ಕೊಂಡು ಇಡರಿಂದ ಅಂತಾಯಿಸುವು ಗಂತ ದೇ ಎಂದುಕೊಂಡು ಬಿಡಿರುತ್ತ ಅಂತ ಮತ್ತು ದೂರವಾಗಿ ಅಂಥ ಇಂಜಿನೀಯರ್ನ ನಾನ್ಯಾ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಡಾರೆಯೇ? ಬಹುಮಂದಿ ಸ್ಥಿರನ ಪಾಲನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯಿತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಜರಿಗೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಭಿಷಯನಿವಾರಣೆ ಅಗಿದೆಕಾದ್ದು ಅವಶ ಕರೆ ಇದೆ. ಜನಗೆ ಅಶ್ವಾಸನೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಅಶ್ವಾಸನೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೋ ಅ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ನನಗೆ ಕೆಲವು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಇದೆ. ಏನಿಂದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಹಿತಾತ್ಮಕಾಗಿ ನಾವು ಕಾಪಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುತ್ತಿರುತ್ತಾ ಮತ್ತು ನಮಗೆ ಬರಬೇಕಾದ ನದಿ ನೀರಿನ ಶ್ರಯೋಜನವನ್ನು ಪ್ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ನಾವು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ನಾನು ಏನು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ ಅ ನಂದೇಹವನ್ನು ಪರಿಹರಿಸಬೇಕು. ಶ್ರೀಮಾಣ ಚೆನ್ನಿ ಬಿಸಪ್ಪನವರು ಲೇಕ್ಕೆ ಕೆಳಕ್ಕೆ ತ್ವರಿತವಾಗಿ 1924 ರ ಬಹುಂದದ ಹ್ಯಾಕಾರ 45 ಕಿ.ಮೀ.ಎಫ್.ಎ. ನೀರು ದೊರೆಯಾತ್ಮದೆ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಲೇಕ್ಕದ 20 ಪರ್ಸೆಂಟ್ ಮಾತ್ರ ದಿಂದಿಂದಿಲಿಗೆ ಮಾದ್ಯಾನಿಗೆ ಇದೆ. ಲೇಕ್ಕದ 80 ಪರ್ಸೆಂಟ್ ದಿಂದಿಂದಿಲಿಗೆ ಮೇನ್ಸೊಲಿಗೆ ಇದೆ. ಅದರೂ ನಿಹಿತ ನಾವು ನವ್ಯ ನೀರಿನ ಹ್ಯಾಕಾರ ನರಿಯಾದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಉಪಯೋಗ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಆಗಾಗಲ್ಲೇ ಮಾದ್ಯಾನಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಕಲಬ್ಬ ಅಳಿಕೆಯ್ಯಾಗಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿನ ಕಟ್ಟಿಕೊಂಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ನಮಗೆ ತಜ್ಜಾರ ಅಭಿಪೂರ್ವದ ಹ್ಯಾಕಾರ 10 ಕಿ.ಮೀ.ಎಫ್.ಎ. ಗಿಂತ ಕಟ್ಟಿಕೊಂಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಇನ್ನು ಶ್ರೀಮಾಣತಿಗೆ 21 ಕಿ.ಮೀ.ನಿ. ಎಫ್.ಎ. ನೀರನ್ನು ಎಲ್ಲಿಂದ ತರುತ್ತಿರಿ. 11 ಕಿ.ಮೀ.ನಿ.ಎಫ್.ಎ. ನೀರನ್ನು ಮಾದ್ಯಾನಿ ರಾಜ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದು ಒಂದು ಹಕ್ಕಿಗೆ ಕಾರಣವಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಅಂತಹಂತಗಳ ಅದಾರವ ವೇಗೀ ನನಗೆ ಒಂದು ಸಂದೇಹ ಇದೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ನಿರ್ವಹಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹಾಕಿಗೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿದೆ ಪಾರ್ಜಿಕ್ ಗ್ರಂಥಕ್ಕೆ ಗೆ 16 ಕೊಳ್ಳಿರಾವಾಯಿ ಹಾಕಿ ಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದಿಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ನಿರ್ವಹಣೆ ನಿರ್ವಹಣೆ ಅಂತಹ ನಿರ್ವಹಣೆ ಕೊಂಡಿರುತ್ತಾ ಇದೆ. ಈ ನೇರಗಿರುತ್ತಿರುವ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥಿ ನನ್ನ ಅವುಗಳಿಗೆ ವಾಯಾಗಿ ಇದೆ. ತಂದೆ ಅಂತಿಮ ಹಾಸುವಾಗ ಅಣ್ಣತಮ್ಮಂದಿರು ಜಗತ್ವಾದುವು ಹಾಗೆ ಅಗಬಾರಾದು. ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶ ಒಂದೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಹೊಗಿಬಹುದಿ, ಪಾಕಿಸ್ತಾನ ಹಿಂದೂಕಾಶ ನ ಅದುತ್ತೇ ನಿಂದಾನಿ ನೀರಿನ ಹಂಡಿಕೆ ಬೇಗೆ ಗಿರಿ ಅಗಬಾರಾದು. ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶ ಒಂದೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಹೊಗಿಬಹುದಿ, ಪಾಕಿಸ್ತಾನ ನ ಅದುತ್ತೇ ನಿಂದಾನಿ ನೀರಿನ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಒಗೆಹರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಶ್ರುತ್ಯತ್ವ ಮಾಡಿ ಕಾಲಕಾಲಕ್ಕೆ ಎಷ್ಟುರಿಕೆ

విషణు అమాయి రాజ్య సాంస్కరిక కౌన్సిలు కొర్టులో బోధించాడు. తెలుగు కోశ్చుత్తాత్తు కోర్టులో బోధించాడు. శ్రుద్ధే ఇద్దరి శ్రీమానో చేన్నటినష్టనము కేళిద కాగే శ్రీనృష్టిభ్రా రైటర్ బిరుత్తదు.

శ్రీ కెప్పో. ఎస్. నాయ్దెల్లారెడ్డి.—అదు యిన్స్టిట్యూట్ రైటర్ అల్లు, అపోల్యూట్రియెండ్ రైటర్.—తావు కేళివయాదు, నని కుట్టువ కుత్తిర ఇష్టేవే, నది ములు భాగద్దుద్దేవే, కలవు అప్పెకట్టే కష్టు ఎఱు బుట్టోగ్గిసుకొశ్చుత్తేవే ఎందు. అదరి ఇందు వాగా జుంసనాగర కష్టు కష్టు ఎఱును బుట్టోగ్గిసుద్దారు, ఆగె యారూ పనూ మాడుపుకొశ్చువుదిల్లి, ఇంధమస్తుతి కానసును ప్రకార ఇదే. అదుదండ నాను ఏనంతి ప్రభాదికేళ్ళువుదు మాన్య జెన్నెబినష్టనమరు కేళ్ళివహాగే ఆ విషయావన్ను సాఫెజుకవాగి జెచ్చేచూదుపురట్లి ఏికితివిచే, కేపు వత్తిచుగట్టు కేగేజెచ్చే పొష్టావుదొండ మాద్వాను సరకారక్కే ఈ విషయు గొత్తుదేర అవరేనాదరూ తల్లిదుకొశ్చుత్తారే ఎంబి అభిపూర్ణయివి. అదన్ను నాను ఒత్తువుట్లి. మాద్వాను సరకారదవరు అగ్రమేంటసే కేళ్ళాగి కేష్టు ఎఱున్న బుకోగ్గిసుత్తుద్దారే ఎంబిదక్కే సాకాచ్చీ ఆకెంటగ్గాలివే. జెన్నెబినష్టనమరు కేళిది కావేలు నాను సేకడ 80 రఘు ఎఱు మ్ముసూరు రాజ్యదిద బిరువుదు, ఇక్కిత్త రఘు ఎఱు మాద్వాను భాగద్దు బిరువువు. అసరు హేళువ ప్రశార మాద్వానిసనమరు 20 లక్ష ఎకరీగి కావేరి ఎఱున్న బుకుత్తుద్దారే. అదే నాపు కేపల 3 లక్ష ఎకరీగి పొత్త కావేరి ఎఱున్న బుకుత్తుద్దేవే. ఇద్దన్ను నోడిదర నమగ్గెప్పు అపకారించి యెంబిదు గొత్తుగువుదు. 1924 నేయి ఇప్పియు ఆప్రమేంటన ప్రకార నమగే ఎస్స్ప్రె అపకారించి, ఆ ఒక్కండ పెంచాగియేమీరు, ప్రసాదే హేళ్ళేసికోశ్చలు అపకారించియేరు ఎంపి విషయాను తల్లిదుకొశ్చువుదక్కే సభే తన కుతూహలమన్ను వ్యక్తమాడింది. అదక్కే నాదం జిప్పి కల్పి అబ్బిజీక్కపున్న ఇదే, ఆగుపుద్దినువెంచు కేళిదరే, ఏ నోం ఆముతు ఇన్నోందు సుల పొతోఎలి ఎందు కేళిదరే వాయ్ పదుర్చరిగే సమాధానమాగుత్తదే ఎందు నాను తల్లిదు కోండిల్లి. ఆ సందేహగచ్చన్ను నివారణి మాదువుదక్కే ఒందు జెచ్చేగే అపకారి మాది కోండబేటు ఎందు ఒత్తుయమాడుత్తేనే.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The House will now rise and meet after half-an-hour.

The House rose at Twenty-five Minutes past Three of the Clock and re-assembled at Fifty-five Minutes past Three of the Clock.

[Mr. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—Sir, the Chief Minister was pleased to say that there is delicacy in the matter. I would like him to enlighten and satisfy us as to what is the matter of delicacy. I want to submit to him through you that this is a matter on which for 14 long years Madras has carried on negotiations and open discussions. Open discussion took place all over the country on these river valley projects and the implications thereof. That is a public matter and not a private matter and we have got to thrash it out in the open House.

Another thing is that we are not begging the question, but we are demanding our rights under law and therefore there can be no question. We must fight out and secure our right. Thirdly, I am only very sorry because the Chief Minister has made a statement that there is

(SRI H. M. CHANNABASAAPPA)

more inclination for propaganda. Ten years ago I was dubbed as Goebbels propagandist in regard to Krishna and ten years later he says that it is not Goebbels propaganda. I would humbly submit that whenever the Chief Minister speaks his speech must be befitting the dignity of the Chief Minister. I humbly submit that this is not befitting the dignity of the office he holds.

4-00 P.M.

ಹೇಮಾವತಿ ಪೂರ್ಣಕ್ಕೆ ಕಷಟಬೇಕ್ಕಾದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಬೇಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇದವೇ ಎನ್ನುವ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಮಾರ್ಪಾನ್ ಸರ್ಕಾರವನ್ನು ಕ್ರಿಳುತ್ತದೆ. ನಮಗೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕ 45 ಷ.ಪಂ.ಸಿ. ಸೀರಿನ ಹಕ್ಕನ್ನು ಬಳಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ನಾವು ಕಟ್ಟುವ ಪೂರ್ಣಕ್ಕೆ ಗಳ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸರ್ಕಾರವನ್ನು ಅವರೆಗೆ ಒಮ್ಮೆ ಯಾನ್ನು ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಎಂದು ಕೆಳಬೇಕ್ಕಾದರೆ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ಬಂದು ರೀತಿಯ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಹೊಂದಿ ಮೈತ್ರಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಲತಾಯಿ ಭಾವನೆಯನ್ನು ತೋರಿಸುತ್ತ ಬಂದಿದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಕೃಷ್ಣ ನದಿ ನಿರ್ಲಾ ಹಂಡಿಕೆ ವಿವೃತಿ ಬಂದಾಗಲೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರದೇ ರಿತ್ಯ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಅಂದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ನಾಗಾಜುವನ ಸಾಗರದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆನ್ಸ್ ಗೇಂಬಿಲಾನ್ನು ಇಡತಕ ಸ್ವಾದಭರಿತ ಅಗ ನೀರಾವರಿ ಸಿದ್ದವಾಗಿದ್ದ ಕೆ. ಎ.ರಾವ್ ಅವರು ಮಾಲತಾಯಿ ಧೋರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊರಿದರು. ಇದುವರೇಗೂ ನಡೆದಿರುವ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿದರೆ ಕೇಂದ್ರದಿಂದ ನಮಗೆ ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ನಾಯಿ ದೊರಕುತ್ತದೆಯೇ. ಎನ್ನುವ ಸಂದೇಹ ನಾಗಾರಜು ಇದೆ.

ఆ సందేశ నివారణీయాగచేతు, నవీ ఏరిం హతికేయాగుచె కాలపెట్టి నావు ఇసు కేసై ఇష్టరో అవరించ నన్ను చుంచిత తీఖగోరి యాన రితి అను కొలపవాగుత్తేదీ, అవాను కొలువా గుండ్రె ఎన్ను పుదర బగ్గె నిదిష్టవాగి తీవ్రాన్ మాతచేికాగివే. ఆ విషార దస్తి నాను కేపల దొషపో చూడుతిర్చి. సకారంద వతియింద వొ స్తు సిగు కుష్టమతు కూవేరి నదిగా ఏర్పు హండిక విషారదస్తు దేహిగే కోగి సకారంద పెర నివాస్తుణ్ణు వాగి వాద చూడ తే నేందు కేయిద్దారే.

1958ನೇ ಇನ್ನಿತ್ತು ನದಿ ನೀರು ಹಂಡಿಕೆ ಅಡಿಕಾರ ಬುದಾಗ ಆಗಿನ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಬುದ್ದಿ ಕುಟುಂಬ ಪಾಡಿದೆ. 1921ನೇ ಇಂದ್ರ ಅಪ್ಪಂದವನ್ನು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ರಿಪ್ರೋಣ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು, ಎಪ್ಪುರ ಮಹಿಳೆಗೆ ನೀರು ಹಂಡೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಗ ಬಿರಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ತರಿಶಿಲಸಲು ಬಂದು ಕುಟುಂಬಿನು ವಾದಿದ್ದು ಆಕುಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ರಪ್ಪೊಂಟ್ ಸ್ಕೆಟ್ ಇವೆ. 19.4 ರ ಬ್ರಹ್ಮಂದ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ರಿಪ್ರೋಣ್ ಆಗಬೇಕೆಂದು ಆಗಿನ ವೈಸ್ತರ್ಯ ದೇಶದ ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರ್‌ಗಳು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಅಂತಿ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ತೇಬಳಿ ವಾಡಿ ಕೇಸ್ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ವಿವುಳೆ ವಾದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ತೀವ್ರಾನ್ ಸ್ನಾನ್ ಬಿಂಬಿಸುವುದರ ಅವಧಿ ಅಂಶ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ತೇಬಳಿ ವಾಡಿ ಕೇಸ್ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ವಿವುಳೆ ವಾದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈಗ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿರುವ ವಿಚಾರ ಗಳನ್ನೇ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ವಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನೀರು ಹಂಡಿಕೆ ವಿಚಾರದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಮತ್ತು ಮದರ್ ಸರ್ಕಾರಗಳು ಒಂದಾಗಿ ಮೈಕ್ರೋಳಿಗೆ ಅಂತಿ ವಾಡಿಕುದು ಎನ್ನುವ ತಾತ್ಕಾಳಿ ನಾಗೆ ಸಂಭಳಿಸುವುದರ ವಾಗಿ ಇದೆ; ಮಾರ್ಚಾನ್ ಸವರು ಕಾವೇರಿ ವರ್ಷಾವಾದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂತಿಕೆಗೆ ಗಳನ್ನು ಎಪ್ಪೇ ಕ್ಷಿಪ್ರದೂರ್ಗ ಆಗ ಮೈಸೂರುವರನ್ನು ಕೇರಳಪ್ಪ. ಅದರು ಎಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಕ್ಷಿಪ್ರ ಪೂರ್ವೀಕ್ಷಿದೆ ಮೇಲೆ ನಾವು ಬಿನಾದರೂ ಕೆಂಪಗಳನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾರೂಭಿಸುತ್ತಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ನಾವು ಮೇಲೆ ವಾಡಾನ್ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಏಕೆ ಕೇಂದ್ರ, ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕಿಂತ ದಾರು ಕುಟುಂಬದ್ದು? ಕೇಂದ್ರದವರು ಮಾರ್ಚಾನ್ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾಗಿರೆ ಪ್ರಾಪ್ತಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಾದ್ದು ಕ್ಷಿಪ್ರತಕ್ಕ ಪಾರ್ಚ್‌ಪ್ರೋಗ್ರಾಂ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾದರ್ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಏನು ಅಂತ್ಯೇಕಳಿ ಇದೆ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದೆಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಕೇಂದ್ರದವರಿಗೆ ಮಾದರ್ ಸರ್ಕಾರವಾಗಿ ಏನೋ ಸುಂಧರ ಬೆಂದಿ, ನಮ್ಮಿಲ್ಲ ಏಕೋ ಪ್ರತೀಕಾರ ಭಾವವುವುನ್ನು ತೊರ್ವುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎನ್ನುವ ಅನೆ ಎನು ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಏತಿಂಬಿಲ್ಲ ಕೆಂಪ ನಿತ್ಯಾತ್ಮಿದೆ. ಈ ದ್ವಾರಿಸುವುದಲ್ಲಿ ನಭಿ ಕೆತ್ತಿ ವಾಡುವುವು ಸೂಕ್ತ, ಇಂಥ ಗಹವಾದ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಸಭೆ ಕಾಡರೇ ಕೆತ್ತಿ ವಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರಬೇಕು. ಈ ವಿಚಾರವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೂ ಕೂಡ ಕ್ಷಿಪ್ರವಿದೆ. ಅದ್ದು ಈ ನಭಿಯನ್ನು ನಾಬಿಕೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಏಪ್ಪಿನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬಹುದ್ದೇ ಅಪ್ಪೊನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕು. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕೆಲವು ವಿಜೆ ರಿಗ್ಸಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿ ಯಾವಾದೂ ಅಂತಿ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುವರಿಗ್ಲು ತೂಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರು ಈ ಕರ್ತೃಪೂರ್ವಿಕ ಎಲ್ಲ ಮುಖ್ಯಾದರನ್ನೂ ಕೆಂಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೇಳಲಿ. ಇಂದ್ರಾಂಶ್ ನಂಬಂದವಕ್ಷಿ ವಿಚಾರ. ಇದುಂಟಿ ಭಿವಾಭಿವಾಯು ಪಿನ್‌ಎಂಬು ಇಲ್ಲ. ರಾಜಕೀಯ ವಾಗಿ ನಿದ್ಯು ಮುಖ್ಯ ವಾಳ್ಳಿರಂತು ವಾಮಿದ ಪ್ರಮುಖವೆಂಬು. ಮುಕ್ಕಾವಾರು ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾವೇರಿ ನದಿ ನೀರಂ ಒಂದೊಂದು ತೂಂಕ್ರಿಯ ಬರಬೇಕಾದ್ದು ಬರಬೇಕ್ಕೆಂದು ಎನ್ನುವ ಹೊರಾಟದ ವಿಚಾರ. ಇಡೀ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಈ ಹೊರಾಟಕ್ಕೆ ಸಿದ್ದವಾಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ತಂತ್ರಾಗಾಗಿದೆ. ವಾಯ್ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷತ್ವ ಈ ವಿಚಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಕಾಲವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿ, ಚೆಚ್ಚಿ ವಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಡುತ್ತಿರುತ್ತಿರುತ್ತೇನೆ.

(The Chief Minister rose to speak)

Sri S. S. SHETTAR.—I rise to a point of order, Sir. It is not safe for the Chief Minister to make a statement at this juncture. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition. Let him call privately all the members of the political parties and decide what should be disclosed and what should not be disclosed. If he makes a statement now and if everything is disclosed, we cannot safeguard our own interest. This being an adjournment motion, he cannot be called upon to make a statement which is detrimental to the State.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not calling upon anybody to make a statement. As for the adjournment motion, that has already been disposed of. We are on the point whether to give consent to the motion moved under rules 147 and 148. If the Hon'ble the Chief Minister wants to have his say, I do not want to come in his way.

Sri S. S. SHETTAR—It is very detrimental to the State if he makes a statement and discloses certain things. When you have not permitted that motion to be moved in the first instance, why should you allow this statement?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Everybody is responsible.

Sri S. S. SHETTAR.—You have not admitted the motion to be moved in the first instance. Without motion being moved, can discussion go on?

Mr. SPEAKER.—The issue before me is whether consent should be given or withheld. That is the only point.

SRI S. S. SHETTAR.—If you have not given consent how can he disclose the details? Either he will defend his statement in the Press or not. In either case it is not in the well-being of the State.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The hon'ble member Sri Shettar has raised a point that I should restrain the Chief Minister from making a statement. I do not propose to do it. There is no substance in the point of order. I have not decided on the point whether I should give consent to the proposed notice. If the hon'ble Chief Minister wants to make a statement, after hearing him I will give my ruling.

“Now these presents witnesseth that the Mysore Government and the Madras Government do hereby agree and bind itself, their successors and the representatives as follows...”

ಈ ರೀತಿ ಒಂದು ಅಗ್ರಮೆಂಟ್ ಆಗಿದೆ. 11ನೇ ಕಲಮಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ :

"The Mysore Government and the Madras Government further agree with the limitations and arrangements embodied in clause 4 to "a" supra shall at the expiry of 50 years from the date of execution of these presents be open to reconsideration in the light of experience gained and examine further possibilities of irrigation within the territories of respective governments and with such modifications as may be mutually agreed upon as a result of reconsideration..."

ఉండు క్రూన్ ఏను అధికారిగుత్తాడినంది, 1974కే ఇంద్ర రిశాస్మిదర్శిత్తాగి బరుత్తు చేంది). 1974క్కే సను రిశాన్స్ దరీత్తుగి బరుత్తుడే, ఆవాగ సమ్మ నిలావు ఏనుబడుము? అదన్న నేపుడబీళకాగుత్తుది. దుష్టువదిది 1924ర అగ్రమెంట్ సమాగ్ర బహిషక్తివాగి ప్రతికూలవాద అగ్రమెంట్ జుదే. 74రల్ యావ రితి అనుకూలవాగునపడక్కా కాయి క్రచుగధన్ను క్షేత్రించుచేకు. సమ్మ సిలావు ఏను ఎంటిదక్కిర్లా ఒందు కషాషి మాదిద్దేవే. ఆపరా దీఘివాగి ఎర్రా అంకి సుఖీగచన్న తేఖాజీమాది సకారికి షపిసిద్దార్. అదు ఆగ సకారిరద్దుదే. 1974రల్ పునః పరితీలనసి బరువాగ సాపే ప్రలూ తుపూరాగిద్దేవే. 1974రల్ నమ్మ రాజుడి తిట్టపియింద, థక్కబూరాదండ్రి చెమ్ము యావ రితి హిందిన అగ్రమెంట్ అన్యాయవాగిదే, ఆ రితి అగదంత, సినేను ప్రయుక్తిశస్సు వాడదిఁఁఁ, అదన్న ల్రా మాకు కి ద్దేవే. సమి ప్రయుక్తిపన్ను చూడుత్తే వేదు నాను తమగేర్రిగూ భరపెయిను, కేందూత్తేనే.

ತೀ. ಎಚ್. ಎಂ. ಹೆಚ್.ಬಿಸಿಪ್ಪ.—ಆಗ ತಾವೆ 11ನೇ ಕಲಪಾನ್ಯಾ ಒದಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಇದು 1974 ರಲ್ಲಿ ರಿಕ್ನೋಸಿಡರೆಶನ್‌ಗೆ ಬಗ್ಗೆತ್ತದೆ. ಅರ್ಥಾತ್ ಈ ಸಂಪನ್ಮೂಲ ಪನ್ನು ಉಳಿಯುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದ್ದು ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ. 1974ರೂಳಿಗೆ ಏನೇನು ಅನಾಹತವಾಗಿತ್ತದೆ, ಅದನ್ನು ಯಾವುದ್ದಿತ್ತ ರಿಸ್‌ನಿಷ್ಟ್ ರೀಶನ್‌ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು, ಅದು ಹಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಬಿರಬೆಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. 1974ರ ಹೊತ್ತಿಗೆ, ಈ ಸೀರ್ಯು ಹಾದಿ, ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕೆಂಪ್ಯೂಟರ್‌ಕ್ಷಿಂಟ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಶಾಸನಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಬೇಕಿರುತ್ತಿಂದು, ತಕರಾರು ಹಾಕದ್ದೇನೇ ಸಾದನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ, ಅವಂಗೆ ಒಂದು ತ್ವರಿತವಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದ ರೈತ್ತಿ ಒಂದರೆ, ಅದನ್ನು ನಿತ್ಯ ನಂತರ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆಗ ಏನು ನಿತ್ಯ ಉಳಿದೆ, ಅದನ್ನು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಹಂಚಿಕೆಯಾಗಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ. ಆ ಭಾಗವನ್ನು ಯೋಜಿತ್ತೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಿರಿ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಏರ್ಲೆಂಬ್ರ್ ಹಾಡಿಲ್. — ಅದನ್ನು ಯೋಜಕವಾಳಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಅದೂ ಅಭಿದೇ ವಾಸ್ತವ ನದಕ್ಕರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಅರು ಎರ್ಲಿ ಕ್ರಿಸ್ತೀಕೆಂದಿಷ್ಟರೋ ಅಗ್ರಹೆಂಬ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಅರುಕೆ ವಿಶೇಷವಾಗಿ ಕಿಂಧಿದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮೌಲ್ಯರೇಷನ್ ವಾಡಿವಾರೆ. ಅಗ್ರಹೆಂಬ್ ನಾವು ಸುಜ್ಞನೆ ಕೂಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲಿಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಪ್ರಾತಿನ್ಯದ್ವೇಷಿ. ಅದು ಒಂದು ಕರಾರಾರ್ದಿ 1974 ರೊಳಗೆ ವಾಸ್ತವ ನದಕ್ಕರು ಕ್ರೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅದರ ಪ್ರಸ್ತುತಿ ಪ್ರಾತಿನ್ಯದ್ವೇಷಿ ರ್ಯಾಷ್ಟ್ರಾನ್ ಅವರೂ ಹಂಡಿತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ನಾನು ಹಂಡಿತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಲೀಗ್ ರಾಣಿ ಯಾವರೆತ್ತಿ ವಿಕಾರದಾದರ್ದೇ ಕೆಂಬಿ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಬೇರೆ. ಅದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ಇಲ್ಲ ದೀರ್ಘವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರೆ ಹೇಳಿಸುವದಿಲ್ಲ. 1974 ರೊಳಗೆ ನಾವು ಆ ಏರಿನ ಗುಪ್ತವೀರ್ಗೆ ಪ್ರತಿರ್ಭಾಗಾಗಿ ವಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲಿಂದಿರುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ನಾವು ಈಗ ಅವೇಕ್ ಪಾರಾಜೆಕ್ಸ್ ಗಾನ್ನು ಕ್ಳಿಯರ್ ವಾಡದ್ದಿಂದು ಇದೆವೆ. ಕೆಲವಾರು ಪಾರಾಜೆಕ್ಸ್ ಗಾನ್ನು ಡಾಗ್ರೆಕ್ ಮಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭದಾದಿಕಾರಾತ್ತಿದೆ. ಅಗ್ರಹೆಂಬ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನಮಗೆ ಸಿಗ್ರೆವ್ ಏರಿ ಏಂದೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಪ್ರತಿರ್ಭಾಗಾಗಿ ಉಪಭೋಗ ವಾಡಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗೆ. ಈಗ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದಿದ್ದ ಪಾರಾಜೆಕ್ಸ್ ಗಳು ಏರಡು, ಒಂದು ಹೇಳಬಾವತ್ತಿ, ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಹಾರಾಗಿ ಈ ಹೇಳಬಾವತ್ತಿ ಮತ್ತು ಹಾರಂಗಿ ಪಾರಾಜೆಕ್ಸ್ ಗಳಿಗೆ ಯಾವಾಗಲಾದರೂ ಕ್ಳಿಯರ್ನು ಪಡೆಯಿರುತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದು. ಒಂದು ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಇತ್ತುರ್ಪಿನ್ನೀ ಕ್ಳಿಯರ್ನೆನ್ನ ನಿಗುಹುದು ಏಂಬುದಾಗಿ ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. 1974 ರೊಳಗೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರಾಣಿಕ್ ಗಳಿಂದ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭದಾದಿ ಏರಿ ಪ್ರತಿರ್ಭಾಗಾಗಿ ಬುಕ್ ವಾಡದಿತ್ತೇಂಬ ಪಂಸ್ತಿ ಅಗೆ ಬರಿಕು. ಇವಕು ಏನು ಸಂಖೇತ ಬಂದಿನೆ, ಮತ್ತು ರೀಕನ್ಸಿಸ್ಟ್ರೆ ಮಾಡಿ, ರಿವೆಂಬ್ ವಾಡಿ ಏಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಅವರು ಅದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪುವಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಈಗ ಆ ಕರಾರಾನ್ನು ರಿವೆಂಬ್ ಮಾಡುವದಿಲ್ಲ: 74 ರಾಲ್ಯೋ ವಾಡುತ್ತೇಂದು ಹೇಸುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅದ್ದಿಂದ ನಾವು ಮತ್ತು ಅರು ಆ ಒಂದು ಅಗ್ರಹೆಂಬ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಹೇಳಿ ಈಗ ಹೊಗೆಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆ ಕರಾರಾ 15 ನೇ ಐಂಟನಲ್ಲಿ “The Mysore Government and the Madras Government, hereby agree that if there is any dispute between the Mysore Government and the Madras Government, such dispute shall be referred for arbitration for settlement and if the party so agree shall be submitted to Government of India.” ಏಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದಾರೆ. ಈಗ ಇಂಧರಸ್ಟ್ರೀ ರಿವರ್ ವಾಷ್ ದಿಸಾಪ್ತಿ ಇ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ವಿಂದಾರೂ ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮದರ್ ನಾರಿಂದ ತಕ್ಕಾರು ಬಂದಿ ಈಗ ಅರ್ಬಟ್ರೆಪ್ಲ್ಯಾಸ್ ಹಾಕಬುಕುದು ಏಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಏರಿಲ್ಲ ಸದಸ್ಯರೂ ಒಪ್ಪಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಬಿರೀ ಅರ್ಬಟ್ರೆಪ್ಲ್ಯಾಸ್ ವಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಇದರಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಸುಜ್ಞನೆ ಕಾಲಹಂತರಾದಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಮಾದ್ದಿರಲ್ಲಿ 1974 ರೊಳಗೆ ಇಂದ್ರ ಎಷ್ಟುರಮ್ಮಿಗೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಎಷ್ಟುರಮ್ಮಿಗೆ ಅನೇಕ ಪಾರಾಜೆಕ್ಸ್ ಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ಕ್ಳಿಯರ್ನೆನ್ನ ಪಡೆಯುಬಹುದು, ಎಷ್ಟು ನೀರು ಗುರ್ಬೋಗ್ ಗಾಂಡಿಪ್ಪೆ ವ್ಯವಹೆಚ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ, ಏನೇನು ಕೆಲಸಕರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಪಾರಾಂಭಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಏಂಬಿ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ವಿವಿಧ ವಿಭಾಗದ ವಿಭಾಗಿಲ್ಲ ನಾನು ಮಾಡಿ ಹೇಳಿದರೆ, ನಮ್ಮ ಹಿತ ರಕ್ಷಣೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಿ ಈಗ ನಾವು ಹಿತಿನ ಅಗ್ರಹೆಂಬ್ ನು ರಿಪ್ರೋಚ್ ಮಾಡಿ, ಇಲ್ಲದಿರೆ ಅರ್ಬಟ್ರೆಪ್ಲ್ಯಾಸ್ ಹಾಕಿ ಒಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ ಹೊದರೆ, ಭಾರೀ ಜಗತ್. ನಮ್ಮ ಹಿತ ರಕ್ಷಣೆ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಏನೇ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ ಏಂದು ನುಮ್ಮನೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅದ್ದಿಂದ ಅದರಮೇಲೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಸಂಚಯ ಬ್ರಹ್ಮ. ವಿಶೇಷವಾಗಿ ಅರ್ಬಟ್ರೆಪ್ಲ್ಯಾಸ್ ಮಾಡುವದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ನಭಿಸ್ಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ತಾರೀಖ್ಯನ್ನು ನಾಗಿದ್ದಾರಿ, ಅಂದು ಆ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಡಚ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ, ಅವಕಾಶಿ ಅವಕಾಶಮನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಡಿ ಏಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದರೆ, ಆ ರೀತಿಯಿಂದಿರು ಅವಕಾಶಮನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಯಾರಾಯಾ ಈ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಗಗಳನಭೇಕೆಂಬಿದ್ದು ಮುಂದೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಬಹುದಿಲ್ಲ ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರ್ಗಳು ಇರುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಅನ್ನೋರ್ಕೆರ್ಕ್ ಜನರನ್ ಅವರನ್ನು ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಕರೆಯುವುದೇ. ಈಗ ಹಿತ ಮತ್ತು ಅವಕಾಶಮನ್ನು ಅವಕಾಶಮನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದವೇಲೆ ಈ ಮತ್ತು ಮುಕ್ಕೆ ಇತರ ಎಲ್ಲ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ದೀರ್ಘವಾಗಿ ಡಚ್ ಮಾಡುವದು ನಾಧ್ಯವಲ್ಲ. ಇದರ ವ್ಯಾಪಕ ಉತ್ತರ ಅಷ್ಟು ವಾಡಬಾರದೆಂದು ನಾನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀ ಜನ್ನೆಬಿನಷ್ಟ್ ನವರಲ್ಲಿ ಕಳಕಾಳಿಯಿಂದ ವಿನಂತಿಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎಂ. ಹೆಚ್ಚೆಬಿಸ್ಟ್. — ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಾಜಿ ದಾಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ತಮ್ಮ ಭಾಷಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಯಾವಾಗ್ಯಾವುದು ಕಟ್ಟಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೋ ನಮಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲವೆಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದು. ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರೆ ಕಳಕಾಳಿಯಿಂದ ಈ ರೀನ್ ಬರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಮೇಂಟ್ರಿ...

ಶ್ರೀ ಎರೆಂದ್ರೆ ಶಾಹೀರ್, ನಾನು ಅಧಿಸ್ಯಾಕ್ಷೇಲರ್,

Mr. SPEAKER.—I do not know what I should say now. But the proposition is that he wants to have an all round discussions about it with leading members of this House, Advocate General and other persons come to a conclusion.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎಂ. ಡಿ. ಬಿ. ಶರ್ಮ.—ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದ ಕ್ಷಿಯಲೋನ್ ಪಡೆಯುಬೇಕು ಎಂಬು ದಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದರೆ, ನಮ್ಮ ಅತ್ಯಾವ್ಯಾದಿ? ಕೇಂದ್ರ, ಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದ ಕ್ಷಿಯಲೋನ್ ಸಿಗಲ್ಲಿಂದು ಚಿನ್ನದ ಕತ್ತಿ ಎಂದು ಕತ್ತು ಕುರುತ್ತುವರ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

Sri D. DEVARAJ URS.—After the statement of the leader of the Opposition, I think my Hon'ble Friend, Mr. Channabasappa will agree. It is always open to the Chair to give consent or not. With the assurance given by the Chief Minister, we can sit and discuss and thrash out all the issues that have been raised by Hon'ble Sri Channabasappa. The Chief Minister has given that assurance. ಇವರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ಇನ್‌ಫಾರ್ಮೆನ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎಂ. ನಂದಿಗ್ಗಾಡ್.—ಇದು 50 ವರ್ಷ-ಗಳ ಕರಾರು. ನಾವು ಈಗ ವೋಡನ್ ಕೆಂಪಿಯನ್ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಿಂಧಿತಾಗ್ಯಾಗು. ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದ ಕ್ಷಿಯಲೋನ್ ಬಿರುಲ್ಲಿಂದು ಅವರು ಅನುಮಾನವನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರಿಂದೇನೂ ಗಾಬರಿ ಪಡಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲಿಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಯಾರೆಂದೂ ಏನೂ ಹೋಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲಿಂದು ಬೇರೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಮುಂದೆ ಈ ನಂಬಿ ಸೇರಿ ಪುರಿಯೆಳ್ಳಿಗೆ ಇದು ತೀವ್ರಾನವಾಗಬೇಕು. ಆತುರಾತಾರವಾಗಿ ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ಲಾಖೀ ಇಲ್ಲಿದೆ ಮಾಡಬಾರದು. ಅವರೂ ನಾವು ಬಿಬ್ರೇಯಾಗುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲ 1924ರ ಕರಾರು ಇರಬೇಕಾ. ಇಲ್ಲಿದಿದ್ದರೆ ಮುಂದೆ ನೀವೇ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಯಾಂತರ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಮಾದಿ ತೋಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅವರು ನಶ್ತವೇಲೂ ಕೊಡ ಈ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ನೀವೇ ಅಪರಾಧಿಯಿಂದು ರಿಕಾಡ್‌ಗನ್ನೀ ಬರಯಿ ಬೇರೆಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ರಿಫೀಚ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ.

4-30 P.M.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member Sri H. M. Channabasappa gave a notice under rule 146 read with rules 147 and 148 requesting the Speaker to give consent to the moving of a motion proposed by him. The motion reads thus :

“This House is of the opinion that the Government should take immediate and appropriate steps for the revision of 1924 Cauvery Valley Agreement between the States of Mysore and Madras.....”

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Sir, it is wrong on my part to interfere at this stage. I beg to be excused. May I make a humble submission? If my friends who have given notice of this motion agree may I request the Chair that instead of your giving your ruling today, the Chair may kindly postpone the ruling for some time so that we may apply our mind and examine it. I have had a discussion with my leader. I am humbly requesting my friend Sri H. M. Channabasappa to agree to this course, instead of pressing for a ruling here and now—as, after all time is the healer.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—I have very great respect to my Hon'ble friend on my right. I have raised a very important issue, an issue in which the Hon'ble Chief Minister is likely to commit the Government of Mysore in the matter of getting clearance. If only I can get an assurance on that, I have no objection to postpone or to withdraw the motion. Because that is an important criterion. In his anxiety to get clearance, what the Government of Mysore has already done is to ask the Government of India to proceed further for the settlement of the matter in dispute. Whatever action he takes, should under no circumstances be of a nature which will vitiate the action taken so far.

Secondly, till such time that this House or representatives of this House discuss this matter threadbare, not only within ourselves, but with all the experts—legal, technical, administrative,—till such time, the Chief Minister shall not make any commitment either to the Madras Government or the Government of India that he will abide by the 1924 agreement and assure water supply as contemplated in the 1924 agreement. If that assurance is forthcoming, I have no objection, you can discuss this matter two months later, two years later. So long as the interests of the State are assured, I have no objection. Supposing after he gives a commitment to the Government of India on behalf of all of us, what is the good of our meeting? The question will have been over. I would expect the Chief Minister as the custodian of the rights of the State, and who is in charge of the administration, to give me an assurance that he shall not give any commitment either to the Government of India or the Government of Madras that he would abide by the 1924 agreement and give a blank cheque assuring water supply. If that assurance is forthcoming, I have no objection even if the matter is held over till the next session of the Assembly. Let the Chief Minister take his own time. I would like not to interfere these matters. I am not anxious to raise a discussion at all. Do you think, Sir, one who has taken so much trouble, would ever jeopardise the interests of the State; I would be the last person. On the other hand, I would do everything to strengthen the hands of the Government in securing the rightful share of waters to the State and see that our rights are safeguarded. That is my interest. I am too old to seek any propaganda or publicity in papers through this. I have already had sufficient propaganda not only by myself, but the Chief Minister also has done it sufficiently. Even the ex-Chief Minister has publicised my name sufficiently and therefore I am known sufficiently all over the country. I do not want any more propaganda. I would request the Chief Minister who is anxious to safeguard the interests of the country to give me an assurance. I would not press this matter till such time as he finds the need to discuss this matter.

Sri D. DEVARAJ URUS.—Sir, all of us know that Mr. Channabasappa is very objective in his approach so far as this problem is concerned. No body doubts his objectivity or sincerity. But sometimes the trouble is, he begins to doubt others objectivity. That is the

trouble now here. Suppose the Chief Minister has already made a commitment then even if we discuss this problem for three days, that commitment cannot be taken back. In my humble opinion he cannot have made this commitment. Supposing the Government is about to enter into a commitment, naturally after this discussion the Chief Minister has already said that he is going to take into confidence some of the Members who are interested, the leaders of the Opposition parties, and discuss the whole matter threadbare. Either Government should be convince of the facts and figures furnished by Sri Channabasappa or the Government should give such facts and figures as would convince the Members so that we should not discuss further. In case he has actually committed whether we discuss it tomorrow or ten days after, how does it make any difference? I fail to understand. When the Chief Minister has made a categorical statement, there are certain matters which according to him, he genuinely feels, may not be in public interest to disclose and which he is prepared to disclose in an informal meeting. I think we should leave the matter at that and not proceed further on the same point, I again appeal to Mr. Channabasappa to withdraw the motion that he has made.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—If a commitment is already made, it is a *fait accompli*. Nothing prevents the Chief Minister from placing these facts here. He can state his reasons here. There is no question at all. If his reasons are sound and are in the interest of the State, we would hail him to the skies. If there are no good reasons, we will have to condemn him.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—What is behind my mind is—this is my final submission. Well here, our leader gave a suggestion. That was readily grasped by the Hon'ble Leader of the House. Therefore, if after going through that process, even after all this, if the Hon'ble members who have given notice of this motion—about 40 members including Mr. Channabasappa, feel there is rationale behind the course that the Government proposes to adopt, then we need not proceed further with the matter now.

Thereafter, later if they feel that they will have to press their resolution, it is still open to them to do so. Let us not be in a hurry. It is said, when we are in a hurry, count 1, 2, 3-up to 10. Then it gives time for us to understand the problem and the situation. Apart from that, I am also making an appeal in an objective manner. Let not the future generation think that this question was not examined in all its thoroughness. I am basing myself on the suggestion given by my friend, the Leader of the Opposition, and not on the suggestion of the Treasury Benches. He is as much interested in this Basin as any one of us and he has the same concern as all of us have. Heaven won't fall if that decision is not given here and now. I am making this suggestion and it is for my friend to accept.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಎ. ಅಗ್ನಿಹೋತ್ರಿ (ಧಾರವಾಡ-ಗ್ರಾಮಾಂತರ).—ಆವರು ಅದನ್ನು ಎತ್ತಾರು ಸಾಧಿಸ್ತೇಂದು ಇದ್ದರೂ ಅವರ ಸ್ವಭಾವ ಹಾಗೆ ವಾಹನವಾದೇ, ಬಡುವದಿಲ್ಲ.

SRI H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—Let him not make a personal remark like this. He must withdraw it.

MR. SPEAKER.—The hon. Member has not understood Sri Agnihotri. His only object in intervening was to relieve the serious atmosphere and make the members laugh. Probably Sri Channabasappa has not come in contact with Sri Agnihotri. He is a humourist who wants to relieve boredom. So nobody should misunderstand him.

SRI H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—If that is so, it is all right.

The suggestion that is being recommended looks as though I am adamant and am not yielding. I am amenable to reason if the Chief Minister gives an assurance that he will not commit the Government of Mysore. Then I will say, I have no objection for dropping it. When that kind of assurance was not forthcoming from the Chief Minister, he had no other go but to press the matter. The Chair can give any ruling.

SRI B. P. GANGADHAR.—The ruling may be postponed. In the meanwhile, the Chief Minister has given an assurance that he will take some of us into confidence and will be convening a meeting within three days. If it is inevitable, a ruling may be thought of. Now that time seems to have not come.

MR. SPEAKER.—I am not eager to give a ruling. I will give the ruling according to my own lights. But now I am not going to reveal what that ruling is going to be. There appears to be a sort of feeling among the members that they will come to an understanding and that a ruling will not be pressed for. So, I will take up this matter last. In the meanwhile, I call upon the next item. The Hon. Member Sri Channabasappa and other friends may consider the whole subject again; I give some time to them for this purpose. Since the Legislative Council is waiting for the Mysore Appropriation (No. 3) Bill, 1968. I suggest that the Bill may be taken up first.

mysore appropriation (No. 3) Bill, 1968

(Introduction)

MR. SPEAKER.—I have to inform the House that the Governor has recommended the introduction and Consideration of the Mysore Appropriation (No. 3) Bill, 1968 in pursuance of Clauses (1) and (3) of Article 207 of the Constitution.

I call upon the Hon. Finance Minister to introduce the said Bill.

SRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE (Minister for Finance).—I beg to introduce: “The Mysore Appropriation (No. 3) Bill, 1968.”

MR. SPEAKER.—The Mysore Appropriation (No. 3) Bill, 1968, is introduced.